

REMARKS

Claims 28-33 and 35-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batio, U.S. Patent 5,949,643 in view of Japanese Patent Publication 07-160363. The Examiner concedes that with respect to Figure 19, Batio does not teach a display hingedly attached to a base unit. See Office Action, page 3. The Examiner cites the Japanese Publication as teaching a three-section display that can be folded together and down onto a keyboard. *Id.* The Examiner reasons that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a pivotal connection in the embodiment of Batio shown in Figure 19 to connect the display and the base unit. However, to modify Batio as suggested would render Batio unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Thus, there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification.

Referring to Figure 19, Batio shows a small monitor screen 215 flanked on either side by an IR or an IF receiving window 206. The small monitor screen 215 projects downwardly and out, away from the main display 215. The presence of this immovable small monitor screen 215 precludes the triple screen 201 from being hingedly connected to the modular unit 202. In other words, the small monitor 215, which is not movable, prevents Batio's three display sections from being folded together and pivotally downward onto the keyboard.

In fact, if the triple screen 201 of Batio were to be modified according to the teachings of the Japanese Publication, the small monitor 215 would be rendered inoperative. In fact, the monitor 215 will have to be completely removed to make room for the hinge of the Japanese Publication. Therefore, the modification of Batio asserted by the Examiner to be obvious would render the system of Batio shown in Figure 19 unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, which is a clear indication that there is no suggestion to combine the teachings of the references as asserted in the Office Action.

Moreover, even if the triple screens of Batio were to somehow be hingedly connected to the base unit, it could not be folded together and then pivotally downward on the keyboard to form a neat package like the screen in the Japanese Publication. Thus, there is no motivation to make the proposed modification, which renders the claims non-obvious.

Further, with respect to claims 29, 30 and 31, Batio does not teach hingedly connecting a first display to a second display and then folding the first display onto the second display where the first display and the second display remain exposed, much less folding the hingedly


connected displays onto the base unit to form a tablet arrangement. The Examiner correctly points out that the embodiment of Batio shown in Figure 19 has hinges 216. As shown in Figure 20, the hinges 216 allow the side displays 204 to be folded inward upon the main display 215. However, once folded in, none of the display screens remain exposed. The Examiner relies on the embodiment of Batio shown in Figure 12 to demonstrate that displays are capable of being rotated and as such, can be folded onto each other in a way that one of the working surfaces of the displays remain exposed. However, the two screen halves 101 shown in Figure 12, are not hingedly connected to each other. See column 9, lines 10-16. Thus, Batio does not teach two screens that are hingedly connected to each other and that may be folded so that both display screens remain exposed.

Similarly, with respect to claims 37, 38 and new claim 41, the first and second displays are hingedly connected and foldable so that both work spaces remain exposed. Further, the first and second displays are foldable onto a keyboard to provide a pen-based arrangement. Neither arrangement is suggested at all by Batio. That is, as explained in the Reply to Paper No. 12, the two embodiments of Batio relied on by the Examiner, which are shown in Figures 12 and 19 are distinct and not intended to be interchangeable. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion of two display screens hingedly connected to each other and hingedly connected to a base unit.

In view of the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection. Accordingly, independent claims 28 and 35 and the claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (MCT.0094US).

Respectfully submitted,



Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]

Date: February 20, 2003



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE